REMARKS

This paper is intended to be a complete response to the above-identified Office Action. It is believed no fee is due. If fees are required, however, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct the necessary charges from Deposit Account 501922/149-0168US.

No Claims have been amended, cancelled or added by this Reply. Accordingly, claims 1-72 are currently pending in the instant patent application.

Section 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 14-20, 27-30, 39-48, 55-60 and 69-72 as allegedly being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) by the publication entitled "A method for on-line reorganization of a database" by G. H. Sockut, IBM Systems Journal, Vol. 36, No. 3, 1979 (hereinafter "Sockut"). Specifically, the Examiner asserts that:

> In regard to claim 1, Sockut discloses an overflow row repair method, comprising: Retrieving a page of memory associated with a source table (page 4, paragraph 7, especially, "the table space or partition on which reorganization operates", and page 11, lines 1-39, especially, "scanning the file pages ..."); Interrogating the page of memory to identify an overflow row (page 11, lines 1-39, especially, "we find a ... overflow record"); Unloading the identified overflow row from the source table (page 11, lines 1-39, especially, "we find...an overflow record...Unloading an overflow..."); Deleting the identified overflow row from the source table (page 1, Abstract etc., and page 4, 6th paragraph, especially, "removes overflow ...", and pages 9-10, Table 2); and Loading the previously unloaded identified overflow row into the source table (page 11, lines 1-39, especially, "Reloading of data ..."). Office Action Dated 19 June 2007 at pg. 3-4, ¶ 7.

The Examiner levels the same rejection at the remaining independent claims (17, 28, 43 and 58). Regarding independent claims 17 and 43, see Office Action dated 19 June 2007 at pg. 4, ¶ 13. Regarding independent claims 28 and 58, see Office Action dated 19 June 2007 at pg. 4, ¶ 14.

Sockut describes a reorganization technique in which "the area being reorganized is unloaded ... the unloaded data are sorted by clustering key, and the data are

reloaded into a new copy of the area. The new copy is then brought up to date ... by applying log entries ... Future access by users is then switched to the new (reorganized) copy of the area. Figure 4 shows the main steps of fuzzy reorganization."[1] Sockut at page 5, 1st full ¶.[2] *See also*, Sockut at pg. 1, Abstract and pg. 2, 2nd ¶. Where Sockut uses "the term area being reorganized (often shortened to just area) to mean the <u>table space</u> or <u>partition</u> on which reorganization operates." Sockut at page 4, 7th ¶ (emphasis added). Sockut explicitly and repeatedly relies upon the fact that entire tables, table spaces or partitions are unloaded *en masse*. See, for example, Sockut at pgs. 1 (Abstract), 2 (2nd ¶), 4 (7th ¶), 5 (1st, 3rd and 4th full ¶), 6 (1st and 7th full ¶), 10 (7th ¶), 11 (1st ¶), Figs. 4 and 6.

In this regard (*i.e.*, the unloading of complete tables or partitions), Sockut operates as described by Assignee in the filed Specification's 'Background' section. Specification at ¶ 6 and Fig. 1. That is, Assignee identifies and describes prior art overflow reformation techniques that (1) unload a complete table space, table or partition, (2) reloads the data into a new copy of the table space, table or partition and (3) replaces the old table with the new table.

In the response to arguments section for the Office Action dated 19 June 2007 ¶ 2 Pg. 2, the Examiner relies on discrete words taken out of context from a portion of the Sockut disclosure to note that Sockut discloses that overflow records are unloaded as part of the act of unloading the **entire** table space to the unload file. It is understood that Sockut must account for the special overflow records when he copies the **entire** set of data for "unloading and sorting" prior to his reloading the data into a new copy of the table space. Merely because the Sockut reference uses the same words (i.e. we find...an overflow record...[new paragraph]...Unloading an overflow),

---

1   As is common in the art, Sockut defines a table space as "a region of storage that stores the data records for one or more tables." Sockut at pg. 2, 9th ¶. Also as common in the art, Sockut describes a partitioned table space as one in which the table space ... [is divided] ... into partitions according to values of the indexed key ... Partitions reside in separate files, whereas a nonpartitoned table space can reside in one file." Sockut at pg. 4, 1st ¶.

2   All references to Sockut refer to page and paragraph numbers in that copy provided to Assignee by the Examiner in the Office Action dated 28 December 2006.

which are common in the art, from non-contiguous sentences in no way allows that Sockut can teach, describe or fairly suggest the distinctly different operation of unloading **only** the overflow records as opposed to performing operations on the **entire** set of data. In contrast to Sockut, the claimed invention unloads only rows identified as overflow rows from an area (*i.e.*, a table space, table or partition). At no time does Sockut teach, describe or fairly suggest any means, method or technique to perform this action. Sockut is silent as to the claimed act of unloading only those rows identified as overflow rows.

As filed, each independent claim recited unloading one or more identified overflow rows (*i.e.*, the act of unloading the entire table space, table or partition was expressly *not* claimed). However, to make this point more obvious, Assignee has previously amended independent claims 1, 17, 28, 43 and 58 to recite only the identified overflow rows are unloaded.

For at least the reason that Sockut fails to teach each recited element of the claimed invention, the Examiner has failed to make a legitimate *prima facie* case of anticipation. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections and pass independent claims 1, 17, 28, 43 and 58 to allowance. For at least the same reasons, claims 2-6, 14-16, 18-20, 27, 29, 30, 39-42, 44-48, 55-57, 59, 60 and 69-72 (each of which depend from one of independent claims 1, 17, 28, 43 and 58) are allowable over Sockut. Such action is respectfully requested.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims: 7, 21, 31, 32, 49 and 61 (Office Action dated 19 June 2007 at pg. 5, ¶ 17); 8, 9, 11, 12, 22, 24-26, 33, 34, 37, 38, 50, 51, 53, 54, 63, 64, 67 and 68 (Office Action dated 19 June 2007 at pg. 6, ¶ 20);10, 23, 36, 52 and 66 (Office Action dated 19 June 2007 at pg. 8, ¶ 25); and 13, 35 and 65 (Office Action dated 19 June 2007 at pg. 9, ¶ 28) as being unpatentable over Sockut as applied to claims 1-6, 14-20, 27-30, 39-48, 55-60 and 69-72 and further in view of one or more secondary references.

Each claim rejected under section 103 is a dependent claim. Each of these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as are independent claims 1, 17, 28, 43 and 58 (see discussion above). Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections and pass all claims to allowance.

CONCLUSIONS

Reconsideration of pending claims 1-72 in light of the above remarks is respectfully requested. If, after considering this reply, the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be beneficial towards advancing this case to allowance, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed.

/Coe F. Miles, Ph.D., J.D./
Reg. No. 38,559

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch, Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P.
Customer No. 29855   Voice: 832-446-2418
20333 SH 249, Suite 600   Mobile: 713-502-5382
Houston, Texas 77070   Facsimile: 832-446-2458
Email: cmiles@counselIP.com